# FINAL NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

Building 1, Suite #140, Community Conference Room
Alameda Point
Alameda, California

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

## ATTENDEES

See attached list.

## MEETING SUMMARY

### I. Approval of Minutes

Mike McClelland, Navy Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. Mr. McClelland announced that Michael John Torrey, Community Chairperson, asked for an excused absence from the meeting because he was attending a City Council meeting.

It was determined that at 6:45 p.m., only six out of 17 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members were in attendance; therefore, there would not be an appropriate forum for decision voting. The March 2001 meeting minutes were tabled for discussion and will be approved at the May 2001 RAB meeting.

### II. Co-Chair Announcements

Brad Job requested that the RAB distribution list be checked to ensure that he is identified on the mailing list.

Mr. McClelland stated that the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) was expected to be signed and completed in March 2001, although during the 72-hour final review process, the Air Force had an objection to three documents that were listed as primary documents. These documents were the Long Term Groundwater Monitoring Report, Operation and Maintenance Report, and Remedial Action Report. Surrounding this discussion is whether the documents should be listed as primary or secondary documents. Mr. McClelland stated that Anna-Marie Cook suggested taking these documents out of the FFA and discussing them when it becomes necessary three to four years down the line.

Mary Sutter asked what the difference is between a primary versus secondary document. Mr. McClelland explained that a primary document has an enforceable schedule. Mr. McClelland stated that his supervisor Ron Plaseied, the Base Closure Supervisor for Alameda Point, talked with Rich Seraydarian, a supervisor from U.S. Environmental Protection (EPA), and came to an agreement that the Navy would go ahead and finalize the Site Management Plan (SMP) and proceed with the schedules as if the FFA were signed. A letter documenting the Navy and EPA agreement to adhere to the FFA schedules will be sent to EPA and a copy will be sent to the Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team (BCT). The Navy would not be committed to funding projects without the proper FFA agreement. Finalization of the schedules will be completed in April 2001.

Ms. Cook stated that a primary document would have enforceable project schedule deadlines; therefore, the schedule would have to be met for submittal, review, completion, and distribution of the documents. If anyone in the BCT does not agree with a decision in a primary document there is recourse and the disagreement is resolved using a dispute resolution process.

Mr. Job stated that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) feels it is unfortunate that an agreement cannot be made between the Navy and EPA. He explained that his management is advocating that RWQCB prepare an order against the Navy to enforce the Navy's original project schedule, stating that it is not now an enforceable schedule. The RWQCB order would have State-stipulated penalties if the project dates are not met. Hopefully, this would give the Navy and the Alameda Project team funding priority.

During preparation of the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) for this area, the Navy took a closer look at the data and found a lack of PAH data for the Newer Marina Village Coast Guard Housing and West Housing areas. Steve Edde stated that PAH sampling will occur at all of the housing areas on base, primarily located in the northwest corner of the base. Mr. McClelland stated that beginning April 9, 2001, groundwater and soil gas sampling would begin at the Marina Village Newer Coast Guard Housing area. In addition, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH), lead, and benzene sampling will occur at the West Housing site.

The Alameda Annex Installation Restoration (IR) Site 02 Draft Remedial Action Plan (RAP)/Record of Decision (ROD) and proposed plan public meeting will occur on April 19, 2001. This meeting will provide an opportunity to discuss the proposed plan and receive public comments.

## III. Status of Offshore Investigations

Michael Pound introduced himself and provided a brief overview of his responsibilities. Mr. Pound provided a brief history regarding the sediment at Alameda Point. The complete presentation is included as Attachment B. The five IR site locations and the basis for conducting the ecological and human health risk assessments were described.

Ms. Sutter asked for the definition of UTL. Mr. Pound explained that UTL stands for upper tolerance limit. Ms. Sutter asked how UTLs deal with chemicals in the bay that pose an ecological risk. Mr. Job responded that Ms. Sutter has posed two questions, a question about inorganics and a question about organics. The difference between organic and inorganic materials was explained. In addition, he described the point source discharges, the regional monitoring stations, and statistical analysis of the data set. Any concentrations below the upper 85 percent of the ambient data set are considered to be contamination contributed by other sources from the remainder of the bay. The Navy originally pooled the ambient data set together and did not take into consideration the outliers, which was not an environmental conservative approach to take.

Ms. Sutter asked if the human health risk assessment used industrial preliminary remediation goals (PRGs). Mr. Pound stated an industrial scenario, which evaluates a workday exposure, was used instead of using a residential scenario. Based on the reuse scenario, it was very unlikely any homes would be built in the area along the shoreline or in the water.

Dianne Behm asked if the specific comments the RAB provided on the sediment investigation would be discussed at this meeting. Mr. Pound explained that only common risk assessment scenarios would be discussed. The agencies have provided comments on Western Bayside and

Breakwater Beach, and the Navy and the agencies are currently discussing the comments. Until the comments are further discussed by the BCT, the Navy is not in a position to comment.

Mary Rose Cassa stated that the purpose of Mr. Pound's presentation is to present the procedure performed by the Navy. If the RAB members have further questions, they can pose those directly to the Navy. It may be a good idea that once the comments are resolved that a follow-up presentation be given to the RAB.

Ms. Behm commented her concern with the definition of ambient, which has been kicked around for a number of years, although no one is in agreement. Ms. Behm stated that when she first became a member of the RAB she had an issue with the difference in the environmental standards used by the real estate industry and the Navy. In her opinion, developers use the commercial industry standard that the Navy and agencies tend to ignore to some degree, and this may be a problem in terms of new reports.

Mr. Job responded that environmental cleanup of soil and groundwater has been occurring for 15 years or so; however, assessment of sediment is a recent science. There is much room for people to disagree on technical nuance where it may have been worked out in some older environmental efforts.

Mr. Pound discussed the sediment chemistry and the data evaluation methods. The uses of effect range mediums (ERM) were explained. ERMs are levels, if exceeded are thought to have a toxicological effect on aquatic ecological receptors. All of the detected compounds with ERMs were evaluated to determine the location of potential toxic effects at Alameda Point.

After data evaluation, the next step was to develop the conceptual site model, which looked at receptors and potential pathway for exposure. This allows the evaluation an avenue to make sure all appropriate pathways were evaluated. Chemicals of potential ecological concern (COPEC) were evaluated according to the screening risk assessments. Bioassay data, which evaluates the organisms that live in the sediment, was also used. The conceptual site model considered human health risk by determining the location where rocks could contain mussels or clams collected for consumption and the location of beach and intertidal areas where people would swim or wade. Chemicals of potential concern (COPC) present at areas where people could potentially be exposed were evaluated for human health purposes. Risk-based screening was performed and the Food and Drug Administration action levels were considered to determine if the tissue concentrations seen in various samples would present a potential risk to anyone consuming mussels or clams from the various areas of Alameda Point.

Ms. Sutter asked what the difference would be between mussels and clams versus off-shore fish. She asked why fish were not included, or if fish would not be affected because they move around too much. Mr. Pound stated that the agencies and Navy are currently discussing the approach to human health risk from fish. One issue is fish that people consume tend to migrate around most of the San Francisco Bay, so they are affected by whatever contaminants are present in the Bay. It is difficult to tie contaminant concentrations in fish tissue directly to Alameda Point sediment.

Once the biochemistry and toxicity results are compiled, an analysis is conducted to determine the confidence level. One issue the Navy has had to deal with is that some tests completed in the early 1990s indicate very high detection limits on some compounds. The Navy must determine if these high detection limits are a decision-making problem. Sediment grain size was an issue in addition to determining if there was ammonia in the sediment, which could affect the results. Based on all of the data and factors, data gaps were identified, and recommendations were made

if additional site-specific data collection was necessary and decisions were made on how to proceed.

A generic overview was provided regarding the ecological risk assessment screening process. Common questions were used for evaluation of each site and these questions were applied to the potential ecological receptors. Receptors include benthic invertebrates that may be exposed through direct contact or ingestion of the sediments and secondary and tertiary consumers of the prey, which are animals that eat the benthic invertebrate and those that eat those vertebrates. The survival growth and reproduction necessary to sustain the benthic-eating community and the piscivorous fish, which are fish-eating fish, were described. Impact is determined by identifying whether fish that are eating the sediment are accumulating contaminants that could affect other fish that feed on these sediment eating fish.

Jo-Lynne Lee asked if it is also took into consideration the adaptability of the benthic invertebrates to toxic materials, such as ants or cockroaches readapting their systems to deal with different kinds of toxic materials. Mr. Job stated that this is difficult, describing a sample scenario where a dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) spill had occurred at a site, and a particular anthropod survived in large numbers because they were the only anthropod that could survive under this exposure to DDT. This became a problem that they could live in this situation because they were uptaking those contaminants and spreading this contamination through the food chain. Mr. Job stated that this became an attractive nuisance. The sediment triad, which is the chemistry, the biology, and the benthic community structure was explained. Evaluating the benthic community structure within the San Francisco Bay is difficult because there are many invasive species that have been dumped into the Bay. It has become hard to tell what belongs in the Bay and what has colonized within the past few years. Mr. Pound stated that in a pristine ecological system, the diversity of the benthic community structure could be analyzed to determine whether adaptability is occurring.

Mr. Pound provided a brief overview of the sites and summarized the recommendation for each site.

Ardella Dailey asked if the agencies agree with the Navy recommendations. Mr. Pound stated a sediment-working group has been developed to evaluate and review the data and recommendations. Ms. Cassa added that at this point a decision has not been made regarding the Navy recommendations. Mr. Job stated that the RWQCB has provided the Navy with comments on the offshore investigation document.

Patricia Ryan asked about the pier area where discharge of vessel wastewater occurred, and whether or not bilge water was discharged. Mr. Pound stated that he would assume that bilge water was included.

Mr. Pound stated that the screening results will be presented in a data gap work plan.

The presentation showed that IR Sites 17 and 24, the Seaplane Lagoon and Pier 1 and 2 Sediments, would be evaluated in a remedial investigation (RI) report that would be prepared concurrently with feasibility study (FS) scoping. Ms. Sutter asked for an explanation of FS scoping. Mr. Pound stated that the FS evaluates the feasibility of the remedial alternatives. Alternatives include interrupting the exposure pathways or reducing the chemical concentrations located at the sites. The City of Alameda has requested that this process be expedited by preparing the documents concurrently. Ms. Sutter asked if this process is being expedited because the chemicals of concern levels are known and therefore, the FS could be prepared

concurrently with the RI. Ms. Sutter stated that she understands the reason that the Navy and the City of Alameda want to get this done early but there is concern. Mr. Pound stated this is somewhat tricky because there are areas within Seaplane Lagoon where there is sufficient data to evaluate the site, and there are other areas such as the northwest and northeast corners of the site where there are high concentrations of chemicals, therefore, additional data is necessary due to the high concentrations. He stated these are the types of areas that will be further analyzed.

Ms. Lee asked if the Navy is confident that there will be sufficient data to prepare a complete and accurate FS if the FS is completed concurrently with the RI. Mr. Pound stated that he feels confident in preparing the FS, although there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved with the agencies before they can move forward. Mr. Pound stated that agency and natural resource trustee discussions would include decisions on what should be remediated and to what level, so that a successful FS can be prepared.

Ms. Cook stated that the agencies and the Navy have different ideas of what constitutes a viable feasibility option. This discussion needs to occur to determine if the agencies and the Navy can agree to the feasibility alternatives. If the agencies and the Navy can discuss the possible alternatives during the RI stage, it may be possible to eliminate a data gap situation similar to some of the other operable units.

During February 2001, the BCT agreed that there are six alternatives to be looked at for Seaplane Lagoon. Mr. Job stated that RWQCB takes the position that the Navy is currently the regulated party, and if and when the City of Alameda accepts this property, they will become the regulated party. At that time, it is anticipated that the City of Alameda will propose to build a marina on the Seaplane Lagoon. It is pretty clear that given the types of contamination within the Seaplane Lagoon, RWQCB will not give water quality certification to build a marina in the Seaplane Lagoon because contamination can easily be spread through the boats prop-wash. RWQCB is in somewhat of a difficult position because the City of Alameda has an approved Environmental Impact Statement, which states that they will be building a marina in the Seaplane Lagoon; however, RWQCB will not approve the marina with the current levels of contamination. On the other hand, the Navy has indicated that they do not want to clean up any further than they have to as regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). There is a possible synergistic solution, such as using the Seaplane Lagoon sediment as a foundation for the IR Site 01 landfill cap. The Navy has been encouraged to evaluate this scenario, because there is a potential cost savings.

Ms. Lee asked if the RI and FS will be a combined document, and what the timetable will be. Mr. Pound stated that the RI and the FS will be completed as two separate documents. Ms. Cassa stated that according to the project schedule, the draft RI for Seaplane Lagoon is scheduled for distribution in February 2002 and the FS is scheduled for December 2002. Mr. Job stated that fish tissue collection and sampling would occur during the summer of 2001, prior to writing the RI.

Ms. Sutter discussed the City of Alameda's $100,000 grant received from EPA and how it applies to evaluating the sediment data.

Mr. Pound continued to summarize the findings and recommendations for each site. The preliminary results indicate that there is minimal contamination in the sediment. There are a few samples that will be discussed with the BCT that may need additional sampling to confirm the results.

Mr. Pound summarized the findings and preliminary recommendations for the Oakland Inner Harbor and Todd Shipyard sites. Ms. Lee asked how much of the channel area is scheduled to be dredged and what the significance of the dredging is to the Navy. It is the Navy's understanding, from talking with the Port of Oakland, that the channels will not be getting any wider, but there will probably be some additional sloping. Elizabeth Johnson stated that the Port of Oakland has recently dredged to 42 feet, and will soon be dredging to 50 feet. Mr. Pound stated that there is a very narrow band of land in this area that can be considered for ecological habitat, and at a certain depth you are not going to have a large habitat. The preliminary chemistry results indicate that the metals analyzed are similar to background, although RWQCB needs to further determine background levels. There are one or two polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) samples that appear to be slightly elevated, and two outfalls are near the locations of the elevated samples. The Navy will take a closer look at these outfall locations and elevated concentrations. If a determination was made based on the current data, the Oakland Inner Harbor and Todd Shipyard areas are not of utmost concern compared to the Seaplane Lagoon and the Pier 1 and 2 Sediments sites.

Bert Morgan asked if there is a history on when the dredging occurred and if the material dredged out of the harbor was used as fill material. Mr. Job stated that the channel is completely manmade. Ms. Cassa stated that it is believed that the dredging material was used as fill material at Alameda Point although it is not documented.

Mr. Job stated that the traditional approach in risk assessment is to delineate the extent of contamination, apply it to the site, and then cleanup the contamination that exceeds the determined risk number. Mr. Job stated that some of the slides presented by Mr. Pound were offshore sites. Based on his understanding of the data, the boundaries of these sites were not derived from the extent of the contamination that emanated from Alameda; particularly back in the 1970s before the site was connected to sewage. Mr. Job asked why the Navy did not delineate the site based on the extent of contamination that extends offshore. This could be completed similar to delineating a groundwater plume and cleaning down to the detection limit.

Mr. Pound stated that Mr. Job would have to provide a specific example to clarify his question. Ms. Sutter asked how was the property boundary was defined. Steve Edde referred to the Alameda Point site wall map and stated that the site boundaries were initially defined by Navy property boundaries. If contamination goes beyond the Navy property boundaries, the Navy would be responsible for determining the extent of the contamination outside the Navy property. For example, a site at Barstow has groundwater contamination migrating off base and the Navy is determining the extent of the release.

Mr. Job stated that the boundaries of Seaplane Lagoon also follow the property boundaries. Based on RWQCBs analysis, they believe that Hunter's Point and Alameda Point are responsible for at least 20 percent of the total PCBs in the San Francisco Bay. Therefore, it is clear to RWQCB that the contamination has migrated off the Navy property. Because the delineation has not extended off the Navy property, which is inconsistent with the way that groundwater plumes are treated, it appears that these two media have been given different treatment by the Navy. Ms. Cassa explained that the offshore site boundaries have not been discussed between the Navy and the agencies.

Lyn Stirewalt stated it is important to remember that the Skeet Range and Pier 1 and 2 sediment sites might be restricted by the property boundary. These sites were originally identified as IR sites during the original characterization back in the 1970s.

Ms. Stirewalt asked if there is still a data gap at the estuary site. Mr. Pound stated that this is why the natural resource trustees want a further evaluation to determine if there is a problem with the fish. Ecologically relevant fish would be sampled within the Seaplane Lagoon. The Oakland Inner Harbor characterization was completed by collecting 64 fish tissue samples and this initial characterization would assist in completion of further sampling and fixed-laboratory analysis. Ms. Stirewalt referred to Attachment B regarding the Oakland Inner Harbor and asked if additional data needs to be taken. Mr. Job stated that this sediment sampling was a reconnaissance study. Ms. Stirewalt asked about the sampling results from the 1970s and asked if the results were similar. Mr. Pound stated that he could only discuss results from the seven current samples. The Navy sampled to characterize the current conditions. Sampling results between the 1970s and today could be different due to the dredging that has occurred over the years.

Ms. Sutter asked if the sediment work being conducted at Alameda Point is a subset of the work being conducted by the Navy throughout the Bay. Mr. Pound stated this is correct. Ms. Sutter stated that the issue of boundaries is not unique to Alameda Point and asked Mr. Job if it has been looked at and dealt with on a site-by-site basis or is there a protocol in place. Mr. Job stated EPA requires RWQCB to prepare an Impaired Water Body List. These listed bodies of water are analyzed to determine the contaminants of concern. The analysis is particularly looking at concentrations of chemicals in fish, and it is found that the San Francisco Bay has high concentrations of mercury. In addition, there is a high concentration of PCBs, and lower concentrations of DDT and other contaminants. Once these contaminants are identified, RWQCB is required to prepare a total maximum daily load (TMDL) study.

Mr. Pound stated that the Navy characterizes their site under the CERCLA framework. Mr. Pound and Mr. Job further discussed adherence to the Clean Water Act guidelines.

Ms. Lee stated that she believed the sediment issues were going to be addressed by the Navy on a regional approach and not site by site. Mr. Pound stated that the original sediment working group ran into difficulty because the variety of bases were at different stages within the CERCLA process, although for consistency there continues to be a team of people working at all bases so that lessons learned are transferred from site to site.

Ms. Cassa stated that the site characterization regarding boundaries could be explained making reference to IR Site 25 where the site was expanded due to the delineation of extended contamination. A similar boundary expansion could also happen in the harbor. The Navy and the agencies are fairly well able to agree regarding groundwater and soil characterization; however sediment characterization is still a fuzzy area due to the scientific evaluation and expertise.

Mr. Pound referred to the "Toxic Units in Sediment at Alameda Point" slide and explained the summation and key to the slide. The different colors on the slide represent the different sampling events, and the larger the circle, the higher the summed ratio. The areas with the ERM quotient points to the corners of the Seaplane Lagoon and the Pier 1 and 2 Sediments sites are the most potentially problematic areas. When you look around the rest of Alameda Point, relatively small circles are found.

Ms. Stirewalt referred to the Toxic Units in Sediment at Alameda Point slide and asked about the green bar being offshore property, and if the rest of the perimeter also has some offshore property. She also asked if the property boundary extends out to the water all around the site. Mr. Edde stated that the property line at the Oakland Inner Harbor ends at IR Site 20.

Ms. Stirewalt asked if the property boundary ends at the water's edge. Mr. Edde explained that it is different than the way it was looked at 5 to 7 years ago, explaining that IR Site 20 went all the way out to the end, because they thought the property extended to that point, but it did not. Updated real estate surveys were completed to determine where the property boundaries were. Ms. Stirewalt stated that when the original characterization was completed, it was believed that they found questionable hotspots all the way out to the end of Oakland Inner Harbor. This is incorrect.

The RAB discussed historical industrial sites and potential outfalls located on the property boundary. Ms. Cassa explained that potential migration for onshore to offshore migration is currently being evaluated.

## IV. Restoration Advisory Board Membership

Ms. Stirewalt stated that RAB membership is currently declining and she believes they need to perform another membership drive. Mr. Edde received one applicant from Treasure Island.

Ms. Cassa stated Ms. Ryan, the Public Participation Specialist with DTSC, would be a resource for the RAB membership team. Mr. Edde stated that he should to be placed on the application form as the Navy contact.

Ms. Stirewalt stated it is necessary to determine the budget for advertising, copying, and printing application forms. Mr. McClelland and Mr. Edde will work with Ms. Stirewalt to determine the budget for the RAB membership needs.

Elizabeth Johnson stated they are about to do a mailing advertising a public workshop for their EPA grant. The RAB membership advertisement could be included with their mailing in addition to advertisement at the public workshop. The mailing will be a four-page fold. Ms. Stirewalt stated that she can provide Ms. Johnson with a revised application for inclusion in the mailing.

James Leach asked if RAB members could receive an updated RAB member e-mail, address, and phone number list. Ms. Sutter stated that she has begun this list and will make additions and corrections and send the list to RAB and BCT members.

Ms. Stirewalt stated that as of April 2001, Bill Mitchell has resigned from the RAB. Mr. Mitchell would like to return to the RAB once he completes his year-long bike tour of the United States.

Mr. Edde stated that a variety of RAB members have not been in attendance at the meetings. Ms. Stirewalt would like to get a copy of the list of attendees for the past meetings. Leah Waller with Tetra Tech EMI will provide Ms. Stirewalt a copy of the past three RAB attendance rosters.

Ms. Stirewalt will further discuss membership recruitment with Ms. Ryan following the RAB meeting.

Mr. Leach asked for an excused absence from the May RAB meeting due to being out of state.

## V. Project Teams, Round the Table

Environmental Baseline Survey Team and Tiered Screening

Ms. Lee stated that the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) team has completed review of their document and will be somewhat inactive for the next few months. Ms. Cook explained that as the FOST documents are prepared, the EBS team would be reviewing these documents. Ms. Cook stated that the EBS document has been finalized, but as the FOST documents are received when transferring specific parcels, the EBS will be used to verify the information in the FOST. Ms. Cook stated that there has been a FOST distributed for comment, for public benefit conveyance (PBC)-1A. Ms. Lee referred to a copy of the transmittal letter although they have not reviewed the document.

Mr. Job asked if the EBS summary was completed. Ms. Cassa stated that a comprehensive guide was prepared and that the CD ROM will soon be issued.

Ms. Lee reported that there is no update regarding the tiered screening team.

OU-1 Remedial Investigation Team

Ms. Lee provided an update on the OU-1 RI and stated that data gap sampling will be completed prior to more documentation activity. Mr. McClelland stated that the data gap sampling for OU-1 and OU-2 sampling will begin in June 2001 and data will be back in the fall. Ms. Cook asked if Ms. Lee has reviewed the data gap sampling plan for OU-1 and OU-2 which was distributed in January 2001. Ms. Lee reported that she has not reviewed the OU-1 and OU-2 data gap sampling plan although Mr. Torrey may have received the document for distribution.

OU-4 Ecology Focus and Sediment Team

Mr. Leach reported there is no update.

IR Site 25 Estuary Park Committee Outreach Team

Ms. Behm asked if any RAB member would like to become the new team leader for the IR Site 25 estuary park community outreach team. She will work on finding a new team leader for this team.

Radiological Team

Mr. McClelland reported there is no update.

OU-2 Project Team

Ms. Dailey reported there is no update.

Administration

Update previously provided by Ms. Stirewalt.

OU-3 Project Team

Ms. Sutter reported that the Army Corps of Engineers is preparing a scope of work for the site stream monitoring survey for OU-3, although it is taking longer than they expected.

## VI. Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team Activities

Ms. Cassa provided an update of the BCT activities. She directed attention to the March 6, 2001, RAB meeting minutes, and the addition stapled to the minutes behind the agenda. This addition will be included with each meeting minutes distribution and outlines the Cleanup Status for Alameda Point. Mr. McClelland is responsible for preparing this update.

The BCT teleconference on March 6, 2001, included discussion regarding the approach to fish tissue sampling in Seaplane Lagoon. As Mr. Pound explained fish sampling will occur for ecologically relevant fish. The Navy, the natural resources trustees, and the regulatory agencies attended the teleconference and there is general buy in, with minor changes to the Navy's original proposal.

The March 8, 2001, BCT semimonthly conference call involved discussion of the human health risk assessment. During that call several issues were resolved regarding comments on the original draft of the OU-2 RI report. The Navy will be taking additional samples to enhance the data phase of the OU-2 RI report. The BCT talked about exposure pathway assessment, the use of soil gas data to evaluate inhalation risk, and the approach for evaluating sites where the risk is within the risk range.

The regularly scheduled BCT monthly tracking meeting was held on March 20, 2001, and most of the morning was spent discussing unfinished action items. The afternoon included an overview of IR Site 26, which is a new site, the Western Hangar Zone.

The second of the semimonthly conference calls occurred on March 29, 2001. Plans were clarified to address the revision of the Site 2 RI report. Discussion also included plans to address the pesticide and lead contamination in soil near the former pesticide storage shack near the corner of Corpus Christi and Pensicola Road in the family housing area. Ms. Cassa stated that they are always looking for topics for future RAB meetings.

## VII. Community and Restoration Advisory Board Comment Period

Ms. Sutter stated that Ms. Cassa provided her with a web site address which offers a citizens guide to different types of remediation. The document is about two pages long and offers very basic information. The web site is www.epa.gov. The information provided to them through the RAB meetings is more informative, but this may be helpful for newer RAB members. If anyone would like a copy of this information please let her know.

Mr. Job stated that Warner Brothers is currently filming a movie on Alameda Point property. They have built an approximate mile-long four-lane mock freeway and overpass. He is concerned because they did not get a construction stormwater permit from RWQCB. In addition, they provided no drainage controls and they cut a ditch into the storm drain. RWQCB is concerned about Warner Brothers because this is a Superfund site and it is important to remain in compliance. RWQCB will be issuing a notice to comply and require that Warner Brothers obtain a permit and provide best management practices (BMP).

Ms. Stirewalt asked who is providing oversight for the base and the Warner Brothers project and how the problem was discovered. Mr. Job stated that the City of Alameda's consultant examined the soil and did not believe there was anything to worry about, although the issue still remains that Warner Brothers did not follow the permitting process. Whenever more than 4 acres of soil is being disturbed, a permit is required. The problem was discovered through casual conversation. Ms. Stirewalt asked what the mandated procedures are for oversight of construction activities. The property is leased to Warner Brothers by the City of Alameda. Ms. Johnson stated that the City of Alameda performs the facilities management function and the City of Alameda was not entirely aware of the extent of the construction. Warner Brothers obtained a building permit from the City of Alameda although the referral to RWQCB was missed.

Ms. Cassa stated that she has previously raised the issue of how to regulate institutional controls and following of the permitting process to the BCT and the City of Alameda although no resolution has occurred.

Ms. Johnson stated that the City of Alameda is addressing this issue with Warner Brothers and the City of Alameda has had several meetings to discuss future protocol regarding similar issues.

Ms. Sutter expressed concern in keeping people out of IR Sites 14 and 15. Ms. Cassa stated that there is a locked gate and fence between the area leased by Warner Brothers and Sites 14 and 15.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA**
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA**
**APRIL 3, 2001**

**(One Page)**

# *RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD*

## *NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA*

## *AGENDA*

**3 APRIL, 2001 6:30 PM**

**ALAMEDA POINT – BUILDING 1 – SUITE 140**

**COMMUNITY CONFERENCE ROOM**

(FROM PARKING LOT ON W MIDWAY AVE, ENTER THROUGH MIDDLE WING)

| TIME | SUBJECT | PRESENTER |
|---|---|---|
| 6:30 - 6:35 | Approval of Minutes | Michael John Torrey |
| 6:35 - 6:45 | Co-Chair Announcements | Co-Chairs |
| 6:45 - 7:35 | Status of Offshore Investigations | Michael Pound |
| 7:35 - 7:50 | RAB Membership | Lyn Stirewalt |
| 7:50 - 8:10 | Project Teams, Round the Table | Team Leaders |
| 8:10 - 8:20 | BCT Activities | Mary Rose Cassa |
| 8:20 - 8:30 | Community & RAB Comment Period | Community & RAB |
| | RAB Meeting Adjournment | |
| 8:30 - 9:00 | Informal Discussions with the BCT | |

**ATTACHMENT B**

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA**
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEETS**
**APRIL 3, 2001**

**(Four Pages)**

**ALAMEDA POINT**
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**
**Monthly Attendance Roster for 2001**

**Date: May 1, 2001**

*Please initial by your name*

| COMMUNITY MEMBERS | JAN | FEB | MARCH | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | JULY | AUG | SEPT | OCT | NOV | DEC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dianne Behm | | X | * | X | | | | | | | | |
| Robert E. Berges (Resigned in Feb.) | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clem Burnap | * | * | X** | X | | | | | | | | |
| Ardella Dailey | X | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Nick DeBenedittis | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Douglas deHann | X | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Tony Dover | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| James D. Leach | X | * | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Jo-Lynne Lee | X | * | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Bill Mitchell (Resigned in April) | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Bert Morgan | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Ken O' Donoghue | X | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Kurt Peterson | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kevin Reilly | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| John Roullier | | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Lyn Stirewalt | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Mary Sutter | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Michael John Torrey | X | X | X | *3 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **COMMUNITY MEMBERS** | **JAN** | **FEB** | **MARCH** | **APRIL** | **MAY** | **JUNE** | **JULY** | **AUG** | **SEPT** | **OCT** | **NOV** | **DEC** |
| Dana Kokubaun | | | X | | | | | | | | | |

Revised 04/02/01
Alameda/Meetings/Rab/SIGNINSHEET.xls

* Denotes excused absense

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Golden Gate Audubon Society | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Betsy P. Elgar | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **REGULATORY AND OTHER AGENCIES** | **JAN** | **FEB** | **MARCH** | **APRIL** | **MAY** | **JUNE** | **JULY** | **AUG** | **SEPT** | **OCT** | **NOV** | **DEC** |
| Patricia Ryan | | X | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Mary Rose Cassa | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Anna-Marie Cook | X | | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| David Cooper | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brad Job | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Elizabeth Johnson | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Phillip Ramsey (reassigned in Feb.) | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **U.S. NAVY** | **JAN** | **FEB** | **MARCH** | **APRIL** | **MAY** | **JUNE** | **JULY** | **AUG** | **SEPT** | **OCT** | **NOV** | **DEC** |
| Glenna Clark | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Andrew Dick | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Steve Edde | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greg Lorton | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mike McClelland | X | | * | X | | | | | | | | |
| Tom Pinard | | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Rick Weissenborn | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **TETRA TECH EMI** | **JAN** | **FEB** | **MARCH** | **APRIL** | **MAY** | **JUNE** | **JULY** | **AUG** | **SEPT** | **OCT** | **NOV** | **DEC** |
| Corinne Crawley | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Alan Driscoll | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jim Jacobson | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marie Rainwater | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Leah Waller | | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **GPI** | **JAN** | **FEB** | **MARCH** | **APRIL** | **MAY** | **JUNE** | **JULY** | **AUG** | **SEPT** | **OCT** | **NOV** | **DEC** |
| Michael Stone | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Jack Clemes | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OTHER** | **JAN** | **FEB** | **MARCH** | **APRIL** | **MAY** | **JUNE** | **JULY** | **AUG** | **SEPT** | **OCT** | **NOV** | **DEC** |
| Charlene Washington-EBCRC | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Luann Tetirick (visitor) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |



* Denotes excused absense

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* Excused absence
** Attended but did not sign roster

# TETRA TECH EM INC.

## TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

**Contract No. N68711-00-D-0005** Document Control No. TC . A021 . 10074

TO: Mr. Ron Fuller, Code 02R1.RF
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 04/03/03
DO: 021
LOCATION:
Alameda Point, Alameda, California

FROM: MWant

**Michael Wanta,** Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

**Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Summaries for 2002, April 2, 2003**

TYPE: ☐ Contractual Deliverable ☐ Technical Deliverable (DS) ☒ Other (TC)

VERSION: NA (e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final) REVISION #: NA

ADMIN RECORD: Yes ☒ No ☐ CATEGORY: Confidential ☐

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 04/03/03

**NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY:** O/3C/4E

O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

| NAVY: | TETRA TECH: | OTHER: |
|---|---|---|
| M. McClelland (06CAMM) | File/Doc Control | |
| O/1E | 1C/1E (w/QC) | |
| Diane Silva (05G.DS)* | Courtney Colvin | |
| 3C/3E | 1C/1E | |

**Date/Time Received**

*Admin Record Recipient

rev 07/22/02